

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

LINEAR TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	C.A. No. 06-476 (GMS)
	)	
MONOLITHIC POWER SYSTEMS, INC.,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

**LINEAR'S PROPOSED FINAL VERDICT FORM AND LINEAR'S  
OBJECTIONS TO MONOLITHIC'S PROPOSED FINAL VERDICT FORM**

MORRIS, NICHOLS, ARSHT & TUNNELL LLP  
Jack B. Blumenfeld (#1014)  
Karen Jacobs Loudon (#2881)  
James W. Parrett, Jr. (#4292)  
1201 N. Market Street  
P.O. Box 1347  
Wilmington, DE 19899  
(302) 658-9200  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff*  
*Linear Technology Corporation*

OF COUNSEL:

Raphael V. Lupo  
Joel M. Freed  
Matthew G. Cunningham  
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP  
600 13th Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 756-8000

Jimmy Shin  
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP  
3150 Porter Dr.  
Palo Alto, CA 94304  
(650) 813-5000

June 24, 2008

We, the jury, unanimously find as follows:

**I. BREACH OF CONTRACT**

Do you find that Linear has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Monolithic breached the Settlement Agreement?

*A “YES” answer is a finding for Linear. A “NO” answer is a finding for Monolithic.*

\_\_\_\_\_ YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO

**II. INFRINGEMENT**

A. Do you find that Linear has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Monolithic has directly infringed, induced infringement, and/or contributorily infringed any of the following patent claims?

*A “YES” answer is a finding for Linear. A “NO” answer is a finding for Monolithic.*

'178 Patent Claim No.	Direct		Induced		Contributory	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1						
2						
34						
41						
55						

'258 Patent Claim No.	Direct		Induced		Contributory	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1						
2						
3						
34						

**If you have answered “YES” anywhere in II.A., proceed to B. Otherwise, skip to Section III. below.**

- B. Do you find that Linear has proven by clear and convincing evidence that Monolithic's infringement was willful?

*A "YES" answer is a finding for Linear. A "NO" answer is a finding for Monolithic.*

Patent No.	Yes	No
'178		
'258		

**III. VALIDITY**

- A. Do you find that Monolithic has proven by clear and convincing evidence invalidity of any of the following claims by reason of anticipation or obviousness?

A “YES” answer is a finding for Monolithic. A “NO” answer is a finding for Linear.

‘178 Patent Claim No.	Anticipation		Obviousness	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
1				
2				
34				
41				
55				

‘258 Patent Claim No.	Anticipation		Obviousness	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
1				
2				
3				
34				

- B. For claim(s) found invalid for anticipation, identify the single piece of prior art relied on for that determination. For claim(s) found invalid for obviousness, identify the item(s) of prior art relied on for that determination.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Each juror must sign the verdict form to reflect that a unanimous verdict has been reached.

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_, 2008

\_\_\_\_\_  
FOREPERSON

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**LINEAR'S OBJECTIONS TO MONOLITHIC'S PROPOSED FINAL VERDICT FORM**

1. Linear objects to Questions I.A and I.B as an improper attempt by Monolithic to parse a single question on breach of contract into two questions in order to get two bites at the apple. Linear's proposed question on breach of contract properly asks the jury whether a breach occurred.

2. Linear objects to the omission of Linear's claim for willful infringement in Monolithic's Questions on infringement in Section II. That Monolithic may disagree with such a claim provides no basis for denying Linear a jury verdict on it. It is also relevant to Linear's claim that this is an exceptional case.

3. Linear objects to Question III.A on validity because Monolithic has failed to provide for identification of references on which any invalidity finding would be based, an identification that presents a more complete and necessary record for any post trial motions or appeal.

MORRIS, NICHOLS, ARSHT & TUNNELL LLP

*/s/ James W. Parrett, Jr.*

OF COUNSEL:

Raphael V. Lupo  
Joel M. Freed  
Matthew G. Cunningham  
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP  
600 13th Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 756-8000

Jimmy Shin  
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP  
3150 Porter Dr.  
Palo Alto, CA 94304  
(650) 813-5000

---

Jack B. Blumenfeld (#1014)  
Karen Jacobs Loudon (#2881)  
James W. Parrett, Jr. (#4292)  
1201 N. Market Street  
P.O. Box 1347  
Wilmington, DE 19899  
(302) 658-9200  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff*  
*Linear Technology Corporation*

June 24, 2008  
2365517.1